NAEB
REGION VI
SEMINAR - WORKSHOP

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
RADIO STATION KWAX
EUGENE, OREGON; OCT. 16-17, 1953

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS
14 GREGORY HALL, URBANA, ILLINOIS

REGION VI

SEMINAR--WORKSHOP

University of Oregon, Radio Station KWAX
Eugene, Ore., Oct. 16-17, 1953

Edited by

James S. Miles, Chairman
NAEB Public Relations Committee

Copyright by

The National Association of Educational Broadcasters

14 Gregory Hall
Urbana, Illinois
February 1, 1955

CONTENTS

Page

Preface. 1

Report. 2-15

Addresses:

Dr. Harry K. Newburn. 16-23

Prof. Alburey Castell. 24-29

Program of Conference. 30-32

Roster of Participants. 33

PREFACE

Due to the need to transcribe the minutes of this Regional Conference from tape, and to eliminate from them the sort of material contained in earlier NAEB Regional Conference Reports, this publication has been somewhat delayed.

It is thanks to the work of James Miles, Chairman of the NAEB Public Relations Committee, who was finally able to edit it into the present form that we now make it available for distribution.

Like all earlier Regional meetings (Region II, March 13-14, 1953, Chapel Hill, N. C.; Region III, May 22-24, 1953, Ann Arbor, Mich.; and Region V, March 28-30, 1952, Norman, Okla.) and the recent Region IV meeting, held October 1, 1954, at Ames, Iowa, this Region VI meeting was made possible by funds from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Our thanks are due Mr. Allen Miller and his staff of KWSC, and to Mr. Glenn Starlin of the University of Oregon, for the securing and transcribing of the minutes of this meeting, as well as to Mr. Miles and his staff for organizing them as now presented.

Besides the abbreviated minutes of this conference, we have included the agenda of the meeting, the roster of persons in attendance, and copies of the addresses of Dr. Harry Newburn of the Educational Television and Radio Center and Professor Alburey Castell of the University of Oregon, for both of which there have been numerous requests.

H. J. Skornia

H. J. Skornia
Executive Director, NAEB
February 1, 1955
Urbana, Illinois

January 13, 1955

Mr. Allen Miller
(Former) Director, NAEB Region VI

Dear Allen:

During the past six months I have from time to time picked up the typed report of the REGION VI Meeting and reviewed it. It lacked considerable cohesion so I asked my secretary not only to read it but to attempt to type it up in better form and to make some sense out of some of the places where obviously words were copied down wrong. My immediate chore and reason for doing all of this is, as you know, to write a report on the REGION VI Meeting. This I agreed to do in a moment of weakness as Chairman of the NAEB Publications Committee for the year of 1954. I have now come to the conclusion that I shall not attempt to digest the things that were said there more than a year ago but rather will attempt to comment on the written report as I have it, bringing out the ideas that were expressed and then allowing you to comment on them in rebuttal or agreeing as you see fit. I do think that Dr. Newburn's speech was of such a nature that it should be reported in toto and it is attached herewith.

I know that you know that I have been associated with the NAEB and its workings for some time. You will remember that I have served (1) on the Board for two two-year terms, (2) as Executive Director for almost a year and a half, and (3) a year as secretary of the organization. This past year has been one of relative quietude while I served as Chairman of a rather stormy Constitution Committee and the not so stormy Publications Committee. Like all good NAEB'ers I read the NEWSLETTER from "kiver to kiver" and plan always to see the offerings of the NAEB Tape Network as they come in.

During my tenure as Executive Director we held the first regional conference of the NAEB in Norman, Oklahoma, and the second in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Shortly after I returned to Purdue, we had the third Regional Conference at Ann Arbor, Michigan. Having been able to attend all of these, the Conference of REGION VI was my first miss. I regret this on two counts, first, that I wasn't able to visit with all the good people there, and second, that I wasn't able to get across the GREAT DIVIDE. I'll rectify the latter but the former is lost forever.

I was glad to see that Ausmus, Skornia and Schooley were present. The NAEB certainly owes a debt of gratitude it will never be able to repay to these three individuals.

The mixture of old timers and newcomers was good, too. You have been with the organization for a long time as have Jimmie Morris, Ed Adams and a number of others. Pat Greene and Ed Barrett I'll remember for their contribution to the Allerton House School Seminar, Summer of '52. Therefore, names were not just names to me but very real personalities. I could almost hear each individual say what the written word says they said.

As usual, I find it difficult to argue with Ausmus. His opening statements in this case certainly set the proper tone. This together with the planning evident in the organization of the Workshop gave those attending a sense of real direction. I can't help but smile every time Graydon mentions the "Fifth Largest Network" but I realize how true this really is. I realize, too, the truth in his statement that this is a <u>cooperative organization</u> which taps the outstanding resources, talent-wise and production-wise of our major colleges, universities, and school systems, not only in the United States, but also throughout the world. On these two pillars the NAEB rests. There could be no better foundation. This, I agree with Ausmus, must be maintained.

If the NAEB becomes "Their Association," not "My Association," then it will cease to occupy the position that it now does in the minds and hearts of all of us.

Having worked with the Fund for Adult Education and the Kellogg Foundation, I realize very definitely the truth of Ausmus' statements regarding the flexibility of foundation negotiations. Certainly here is the place where the utmost in latitude must always be allowed the governing body of any association. In all dealings with foundations we must be prepared for quick changes. Sometimes this may mean a reinterpretation of our basic policy. As long as we have the type individuals we have on our Board and serving as our officers I will always believe that they will do thier best for the Association and its members.

You know as well as I some of the problems that the Board and the Executive Office have had in the past, in understanding one another. The question of establishing policy, whether it was established by the Board, or whether it was established through the persistence of operations, and just what was operations, is a moot question. It must be decided, knowing the background to each individual case. I'm happy to note that this took up a great deal of time in the discussion period. Nothing is any more difficult for a member who has not served in one of these capacities to understand than this. Thankfully the United States is well "organized." Thus if some of our members have not served on the Board of the NAEB, at least they have served on the board or in some executive capacity with some other organization and realize how impossible it is to check every detail with the total membership.

I think, too, that the other question that Graydon raised more than likely served as a kick-off for the fifteen or so points that were discussed and on which I would like to comment in detail. They are still points that need further determination.

Graydon asks the members: "Where does the NAEB go from here? Does it become the professional organization? Does it continue to be a producing organization? Should it attempt to become an international association? What sort of cooperation should it have with other organizations also interested in the education of the people of the United States?" This certainly was the type of challenge that should have been thrown down to a group gathering from all over the area to discuss their association. That these individual groups met, discussed, came in with recommendations, indicates how well again the meeting was planned and how good a job Ausmus actually did.

Let's now go to the points raised. The order in which I present these will probably not be in the order that they were presented at the REGION VI Meeting. I am handicapped here inasmuch as I have none of the written material that you gave to the people who attended. However, I think that I have most of the points, -- twelve to be exact, -- of the fifteen that were brought up. Perhaps I have grouped some of them so that actually all fifteen are represented in the following list.

1) NAEB NETWORK OPERATIONS. The questions raised here were ones that have been raised for years and more than likely will continue to be raised every time NAEB'ers get together. The perennial fight for more quarter-hour programs, for better editing, for more variety, more drama, more interviews and perhaps less straight talk and music. All of these are questions that have no real answer. It goes back to the basic idea that this Network is a cooperative venture. As long as it is, and as long as it utilizes programs from its members, the programs offered on the Network will be no better than the members prepare for home consumption. In many cases they cannot be as good because the home consumption type oft-times has aparticular local flavor, that has no meaning outside the confines of that station's listening audience.

I am glad to see that the folks thought that the number of programs offered on the Network was okay. I had long felt that the Network programs should occupy somewhere between 5 and 10% of the operating schedule. I know that in many cases they occupy far more but I am sure that with a station operating over 50 hours per week, Network programs do not occupy more than this. Here at WBAA, it's closer to the 5%, as I am sure it is at KWSC and a number of others. The current offering contains about as many programs as stations can assimilate. On the other hand, it's about as many as can be culled from the number which are offered to Headquarters regularly.

The editing problem is one that can be whipped. One of the best ways to operate anything of this nature on a mechanical basis is to do it at one place with one man. He can catch the obvious discrepancies in time; he can take care of the mechanics of getting the proper introduction, of getting enough information for publicity, of getting the proper times. He, however, cannot do the analysis that might be done by one of the other methods you suggested unless he happens to be a very unusual person. Therefore, while this tends to look very good mechanically it has some drawbacks from the aesthetic point of view. If you get this aestheticism by having a number of stations listen and critically analyze each Network program before it is offered, you get yourself into an almost impossible detail-weighted position. I think our past experience with attempting to produce programs by a committee leads us to believe that only broad policies must be set down by the Committee and these must then be left to an executive to handle in the manner which best fits. Of course, sending it around to the member stations to do "for free" helps the budget but the numerous details frighten me. I was happy to note that you finally arrived at the position that Network programs were better than when the Network started nearly four years ago, and that they will certainly get better every year the Network operates.

2) ELECTION OF REGIONAL DIRECTORS. I don't mind telling you that I am thoroughly confused on this matter. I've listened to the arguments on this question for the better part of six years and there are certainly good things to say on both sides of the issue. If I was personally forced to vote I would say let's elect the Regional Directors as a group, by the total membership. I like to feel that while one director may be from the West Coast, he still is a member of my Board of Directors. Some day a region might elect a director who would never have gotten anywhere on a national slate. Of course, you could turn this thing around and say that the ignorance of the people outside the region about members in that region would tend to do this same trick. I still feel that I'd like to vote for each one of the Directors of the NAEB, but I know this is at variance with your recommendation and generally, at variance with the wishes of the total membership, so I'll be content to vote for the Director of Region III when my turn comes.

3) REPRESENTATION OF GROUPS ON THE BOARD: I was very happy to know that you came to the consensus that the Board should not have a School Station Representative per se. Board members must represent broadly; they must not speak for any special group within the Association; they must attempt to do the best for all members. This does not say that the school station manager might not be a better man than the operator of a college station but I would rather elect him for his integrity and brilliance rather than for the reason that he is a school station man.

4) REDISTRICTING OF NAEB. Your suggestion of dividing REGION VI into Region VI (A), composed of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and western Montana, and Region VI (B) composed of California, Nevada, Utah and Arizona, has some merit. Your analysis of the Board of Directors acting as a senate rather than a house of representatives is also good. However, I feel that there must be

some idea of proportional representation. I am sure that John Dunn, when he made up the Districts, and the Board when it approved them, many years ago, had a combination of houses in mind. I am happy that you threw this whole matter back to the Directors -- I think that's where it belongs -- someone has to work out an equitable plan. Perhaps there are other districts that likewise need some breaking up for geographical purposes alone. You will remember that at your insistence, the Constitution Committee this past year took steps to make it possible for the Board to create anywhere from five to ten Regions. If I am not mistaken, this was one of the few things which met with informal support at the business meeting in New York City this last fall (October, 1954). Thus the membership agrees with your thinking that the Board should come up with a definite plan for redistricting.

5) ANNUAL MEETING. I couldn't agree with you more. Certainly it would lend strength to the Association if the meeting were always held in the Chicago area. But perhaps your solution of one in Chicago, then on the East Coast, then Chicago, then one on the West Coast, then Chicago again, is a good answer. I am sure this will come up for more discussion in Chicago in 1955 and your recommendation should be presented at that time.

I would like to comment on one other thing that was sort of tossed in backwards at this meeting. I believe it was Pat Greene who made the statement that we did not have a tradition of meeting on institution campuses. If we do not have, it's because it was broken down by the meetings at Biloxi, at New York, and now by this meeting-to-be in Chicago. I believe that if you will check all the rest of the meetings, national and regional, you'll find that they were held upon college campuses. I, for one, think they should continue to be held on college campuses. The facilities are good at the larger institutions, and prices are usually less expensive than in the major cities.

Transportation to some places is difficult, but even this, with the feeder airlines that we have nowadays, is not a serious problem.

6) REPRESENTATION OF ASSOCIATE MEMBERS ON THE BOARD. The REGION VI meeting evidently agreed that Associate members do not need representation on the Board. It also appears that you felt that the NAEB should continue to be an Association of operating stations. While your discussion tended to make this an either/or proposition I do not view it as such. I think we should make every effort to cultivate Associate members and I think they should be eligible for Board membership just as any Active member is eligible for Board membership. I do not believe that the sheer fact that the NAEB now allows only operators to be Active members and only Active members to be officers or Board members has anything to do with the desire or ultimate consummation of plans for an institution to operate a station of its own. This has a corollary, of course, in "Should NAEB Network programs be made available to Associate members?" I have always held that Associate members should have a way of securing certain programs from the NAEB Network. Here I am inclined to agree with Dr. Newburn that in those situations where there is no educational station, service should be given educational institutions who have agreements with commercial stations. You always have to put in, of course, the restriction that only certain programs will be available because of copyright, union and other factors.

7) NETWORK ASSESSMENT FEES. The discussion about fees was most interesting. I can see your fine hand in this topic. I also see that you were quite vocal on your "FIFTH YEAR PLAN." As you know, this is one point on which we have always agreed. Like you I do not feel that we do enough to support our Association. I know that each institution is going to have to do more. Your FIFTH YEAR PLAN is a very fine start in the right direction. I am sorry to see that some of the members still do not understand the provisions of the

Kellogg Grant. At this late date members should know what this is about. Adequate material has been distributed and there have been sufficient questions asked and answered at national and regional meetings. I suppose it's one of those things that have to be gone over and over, again and again.

I was intrigued, as I have been in the past, by the proposal from someone that we put the NAEB Network on a cost per program basis. This has long appealed to me but I could never see quite how it could be made to work. Many people feel that we do not have a large enough potential to make it possible to operate on this basis and still effect the economy of mass duplication and distribution that is necessary. However, this certainly should be given some study. It is questionable that you should pay for all of the programs whether you use them or not. Some people will condemn me for saying so but we here at WBAA have, I believe, played at least 95 per cent of all the programs ever offered on the NAEB Network. We may not be as discriminating as we should, but we feel that these programs add materially to our program schedule. Some were not as good as others, but in the main they did enrich our program fare.

8) SHOULD THE NAEB BE AN INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION? Your decision that we should continue to cooperate with the broadcasters of other countries and step up our efforts in the Americas and the Far East was most heartening. I am glad to know that your group realized that communication is basic to understanding and that we have one of the greatest means of communication at our disposal. Our experience this fall with an exchange Fulbrighter from RADIO ITALIANA has been most satisfying. He has been here since October and plans to stay until June. I am sure that he will add to our understanding, not only of Italy but of all peoples who come from a different background and have a different language from ours. We have had foreign students on our campus for years, -- some 300-400 of them -- but we have never had this close day-by-day

contact with a man in our subject field before. I wish that every NAEB station could have such an experience with such an individual.

9) NATIONAL SCRIPT EXCHANGE. This certainly is an old clinker. You will remember in the first grant-in-aid project we thought we had an answer to this problem when one of the grantees asked for money to select scripts and to publish a book of them. These scripts were not barn burners perhaps, -- they were good, and they were used, I am sure, in a great number of places. They were edited well, production notes were in good shape and they were free from copyrights and so forth. Nevertheless, the membership just did not like the idea and I fear will never like the idea of exchanging scripts. I've had young producers here take apart scripts written by established veterans, and say that they were just so much pap. Perhaps this is pure ignorance, but maybe too it means that we have our own way of expressing ourselves. The only way is for each to write his own or cause them to be written for us with our ideas specifically in mind. I am afraid that we at WBAA did not produce any of the programs that were written under that grant-in-aid. We still have the scripts, maybe someday we'll find them better than we had originally thought. I know that we would have nothing to contribute to a national script exchange and I have yet to see very many scripts that I would like to pick up and try to utilize on a regular basis from another NAEB member.

10) SHOULD THE NAEB CONTINUE TO BE IN THE PRODUCTION BUSINESS? This has almost gone down the river. It is certainly true that it takes facilities to make such production possible. Facilities indicate need for large capital investment. Therefore, it seems to me that the grants-in-aid are about as far as we can go in this direction. The grants enable us to use the already existing facilities a little more than they are being used at the moment. It will take someone with a lot of money to set up facilities equivalent to some of

our better ones like Michigan or Oklahoma, and then quite a sizeable annual budget to operate it with the hopes that maybe we can get some programs from it. I tend to believe with some of the members at your meeting that we should stay out of the production field. This is not to say that someone should not produce another series like the JEFFERSONIAN HERITAGE or THE WAYS OF MANKIND, but I am not at all sure that the NAEB as an Association should do so. This is in direct variance with the consensus of your group. However, I did not see anything in the reporter's notes arguing pro or con on this matter, -- merely the simple statement that the NAEB should continue to produce programs.

11) STATION BUDGETS! I remember in going over the old files in some attempt to set up a history of NAEB, that in 1937 the late W. I. Griffith, then Manager of WOI at Ames, Iowa, took two pages to write to Frank Schooley and Jim Ebel at the University of Illinois, asking them to be sure to be by their telephones shortly after 7 P. M. on a certain evening so that he could place a long-distance station-to-station call at reduced rates and hope to get a particular question answered. All of us who knew Griff will remember that he more than likely had a 3-minute egg-timer by the telephone too. I use this merely as an example of the tightness of all budgets not too long ago and certainly it is not a slur on Griff, whom all of us knew and loved. I believe it was Pat Greene who said at your meeting that their station had been at it for 31 years and they still hadn't all the money they needed by a long way. This may or may not be solace to a newcomer but it does indicate the long-term effect of which all of us in educational broadcasting are so well aware. It certainly is good to get together with others and compare and perhaps commiserate on one's budget troubles. Some of that commiserating can be done at home now, thanks to our good friend from Marshall College who put out such an excellent publication about a year ago. If my memory serves me

correctly, Burton Paulu did something quite comparable not more than five years ago and I expect that something similar will have to be done five years hence in order that people may understand how budgets grow as respect for the operation grows. It seems quite popular today for many employers to place a big card on the office wall with the single word "THINK" on it. Undoubtedly this is needed around educational radio stations as well but if I were to have my choice of cards I wouldn't put up the word "THINK," -- the word "PATIENCE" would be much better, or perhaps just "WAIT".....

12) FM PROMOTION. Some will certainly take heart when I tell them that the Chairman of our Television Policy Committee here at Purdue has agreed to spend several thousand dollars on a series of 8 television programs and that he, after reading the first set of scripts, was so elated that he called me at ten o'clock at night and stated: "If these are as good on television as they are on paper, I will have to buy a TV set." May I drop one little gem in here? I don't know how many people saw it, but it seemed to me that one answer to this whole problem was displayed at the NAEB Convention in New York with the little gadget that goes on the television set and makes it an FM receiver. Vernon McKown of New Albany was in the office recently and stated that while their television and radio dealers down there didn't want to handle the sale of this, he thought he could get permission to sell it through their school system to those parents who might want to listen to their kids at home and who would not pay $50.00 for an FM receiver but who had TV receivers and might well pay $20.00 for one of these gadgets. Of course, I don't think I need to say that circulation is only a portion of the problem. It is true that you have to have receivers before you have listeners, but its also true that you have to have something which people want to hear. Here you certainly must say "Set a goal, be true unto it, and allow it to develop over the years, not the weeks."

This, then, Allen, seems the gist of the REGION VI Meeting and my comments on it. It certainly is not a report and it may not even be a review in the strict sense of the word. Perhaps I have just taken it as a stump from which to express some of my own opinions. However, I believe they are the basic problems confronting the NAEB today and they will require all the enlightenment possible before they can be solved. I hope the readers of this will take what I have said and consider the source just as I took a good many of the things that were said in the meeting and considered the source of them.

One thing I haven't done is follow through with the television discussion which I am sure was interesting, but which, by the very nature of the brute is changing so rapidly that what was said is undoubtedly considerably out-of-date now. Then, too, there is the possibility that some of the things that were said should not be repeated now because of those subsequent developments.

Again, I am sorry I could not get to this meeting. I know now that it was a good one and I would have liked to have sat in on the discussions. You know, of course, that REGION IV has held a meeting since yours, so now if we get REGION I to hold theirs, in the very near future, we will have made a complete round robin. When we tie this up with the combined Workshop-Convention, forthcoming in Chicago next Fall, I believe that we will have rounded out five years of development, growth and expansion with the wonderful help of the Kellogg Foundation in an advisory and financial capacity, and the tremendous work on the part of the members, both those who have served on the Board and in officer capacity, and those who have not. In retrospect, it is all pretty wonderful.

Where do we go in the future? Well, perhaps another round of conferences in the various regions will be forthcoming and will help to design our direction.

Sincerely,

s/ Jim

James S. Miles, Chairman
NAEB Public Relations Committee
(Former NAEB Executive Director)

Copied at NAEB Hqs. 1/19/55-cr

A Report on the
EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION AND RADIO CENTER
(to NAEB Regional Meeting)

by

Dr. H. K. Newburn, President

I am pleased to talk with you here in Eugene. I do not think I need to confess, however, that I am not going to add very much to your technical knowledge in the area of radio and television. Perhaps, instead, I can give you, briefly, some of the underlying educational thinking which has gone into our plans for the Educational Television and Radio Center.

I told Mr. Starlin, when he passed along Mr. Miller's invitation for me to speak tonight, that I would be glad to accept if I could do so in an informal manner, and if I could take advantage of the opportunity to gain as much from you as I might be able to give. I say this because, as all of you know, the NAEB was one of the organizations instrumental in the establishment of the Center, and we are building upon a sound and well-established base in educational radio developed by many of you people.

The Center is an independent, non-profit, educational corporation. I use the word independent advisedly because although our resources come from the Fund for Adult Education we operate as a separate unit, responsible to our own Board of Directors. I think this is one of the most important things which I can mention because it is pretty generally misunderstood over the country.

I am afraid many people, for example, feel we have unlimited funds and that we are going to employ a staff of somewhere in the neighborhood of two or three thousand people. At least, that would be the conclusion one might draw from the mail which we have been receiving. Such is not the case, however, and the Center's financial resources are in reality quite limited.

As to our Board of Directors, we are highly pleased with the broad representation which it provides. It is made up not only of leaders in the field of education, but of representatives from business and the professions as well. There's a banker on the Board, an outstanding lawyer, a leading economist, and, of course, a representative from your own ranks, Dick Hull.

On the financial side, the Center has funds for overhead operations for about four years and for programming for approximately three years. Thus far, the original source of funds has been the Fund for Adult Education, an independent organization created by the Ford Foundation. Both the Fund and the Foundation, however, have taken the view--which I fully support--that the Center should not become primarily associated in the minds of people with any parent organization, but should attract financial and other support from a much broader base. Thus, we are hoping, over the years, to find additional sources of support to balance out the aid which we presently have. That the corporation eventually will become, in a sense, self-supporting is the hope of those who have organized it. This raises a problem of serious implications to all of us here.

Turning to functions of the Center, it is designed primarily--I would say almost solely--as a program aid in the areas of radio and television. You will hear a good deal more, I presume, about the aid for television in the first year or two of operation, but we are not unmindful of our responsibility to radio as well. In fact, I think if you would take grants made to date you would find more support devoted to radio than to television.

With that general definition of function, it follows that the hope of almost everyone who has had some connection with the Center is that, through its efforts and resources, the program services of educational television will be enhanced and of higher quality than might be possible otherwise. I am certain I do not have to tell you that this has been one of the great problems of educational radio. Speaking as an ex-school administrator, I must admit that the type of financial support which has been available to educational radio, with but a very few exceptions, has been most inadequate indeed.

If such a pattern holds over to educational television, where the costs will be much greater but the educational potential much higher, it is inevitable that the results will be far worse, at least in terms of educational goals which we might have achieved. In fact, it seems to me, that unless all of us can put our heads together and provide the resources necessary--both ideas and funds to bring the ideas to fruition--the possibilities of educational television are quite limited.

Thus, I have sketched the philosophy underlying the Center's approach to its problems. By concentrating our efforts in the area of program services, we feel we will be making the greatest contribution to educational television and radio in this country. Such a concentration will mean that, of necessity, we shall be unable to assume primary responsibility for other important problems such as engineering services, grants for equipment, the many problems of personnel for stations, and related fields. To be sure, we shall be interested in these areas because of the influence they will have upon the type and quality of program materials which we will be getting, but they are not our primary areas of operation.

Within this framework, you will ask, how does the Center plan to go about its job? I wish I could be more specific on this point, but I cannot, primarily because our operation is so new. However, I can indicate to you some of our tentative thinking as we move ahead in our planning and operations.

In the first place, we do not conceive of ourselves as a primary producing agency. We believe that our job is to get the production done, but not by directly entering the producing business with our own staff. In short, we intend to seek such production help from the educational stations themselves; from universities and colleges with television, radio, and film units; and from independent producers.

Secondly, and consistent with the above point of view, we feel that we should operate with a very small, full-time central staff and depend to a great extent upon highly-skilled and specialized, part-time or temporary help. Now that conception is based upon several assumptions, but one of them I think is very important to you people.

There is, it seems to us, a real danger implicit in such an organization as ours. This danger is that it will, without meaning to do so, tend to dominate to some degree programming from the standpoint of ideas and philosophy. We are fully aware of that possibility, and we certainly shall do everything we can to prevent it from happening.

We think one of the ways in which we can avoid such an unconscious influence is by calling upon people from all over the country to help as consultants, bringing them in on a special job, a special assignment, or a special program series. Thus, we take into our staff a more varied group, not only from the geographical point of view, but also from the standpoint of general background and thinking.

This is not the only reason for operating with a comparatively large staff of part-time consultants. We also feel that in so doing we implicitly say to the people in the field that this is a cooperative enterprise, a common job, in which their special talents and abilities are needed. I cite the following as an example only.

Bob Hudson, who is in charge of our program development, has a long list of possibilities to check and evaluate. Obviously, he can't examine all of these himself. To handle this problem, we could do one of two things: add to our staff a half-dozen people on a full-time basis, or pick up people from your ranks and elsewhere around the country who have special qualifications for the particular job we have in mind. Naturally, we feel that the latter approach assures us of highly important skills, which we might otherwise be lacking, and also provides more varied approach to the entire programming problem.

Turning from program production to another area of our operation, it also is becoming increasingly clear to all of us on the staff that we cannot hope to develop a great warehouse, or a series of warehouses over the country, of film materials, and attempt to stock these "depots" with all the film material which is currently available. It had been proposed that we do this by going to the commercial houses that produce and distribute film and making arrangements to obtain copies of film materials which our affiliated stations might want. Then, instead of dealing with each individual producer, the stations would be able to requisition films from a single warehouse.

Our reason for not going into an extensive operation of this kind is not because we think there is no possibility for a real service, but because we feel we can gain the same end without getting involved in such a large-scale distribution setup that it might become the tail that wagged the dog. Instead, we are giving serious consideration to a plan of working with station managers and potential suppliers of educational film to obtain a more favorable arrangement based upon multiple usage. This eliminates the necessity of setting up and maintaining the physical distribution facilities for such an operation. At the same time, I should add, we are not ruling out the possibility of obtaining selected programs to be included as part of a program packet which the Center will distribute directly.

Turning now to more specific plans, we have decided--and I hope this is not too optimistic--to offer the stations which will be on the air during the first part of the year an average of five hours of programming per week beginning on January 1. At the outset we do not expect to supply a full five

hours each week, but later, as the supply of programs becomes greater, we hope to increase the weekly package so that an average of five hours will be attained over the year.

Where will the Center obtain this material? In general, we expect our chief sources of program materials to fall into three broad categories: (1) those programs produced by educational television stations and distributed by the Center (exchange programs); (2) those programs produced for the Center by educational and commercial television stations, by universities and colleges, and by commercial film producers (produced programs); and (3) those programs selected from the great variety of film resources already available and which have been, or can be, cleared for educational television uses (acquired programs).

Our first source of supply is quite an extensive one. We already have a long list of proposed exchanges that various agencies feel are worthy of national distribution. This doesn't mean such programs are ready to go on the air in the form in which they should go into a package, but at least they are not just ideas.

In short, it looks as if in the long run the exchange method can produce a good deal of excellent material. Most of this we hope to get at a relatively low cost, perhaps little more than the out-of-pocket cost of the unit which produced the material; in other words, the difference between what it would cost if the local station were to put it on the air for itself and the additional operations necessary to put the film on kine into our hands for exchange.

The second source of supply is through direct production contracts. In most cases, we think of these as internal contracts because they will be either with educational television stations themselves or institutions which have film production units. These contracts will be just that--an agreement with a station or a university to produce a specific series of programs for the Center. In some cases we may pay the entire cost of production; in others, only part.

This source of supply, we feel, will be quite productive over the years, and we have every hope of getting materials which will vary all the way from what might be called acceptable to really distinguished programs. Already there are signs that some of these agencies will be able to do an outstanding job in this area.

Finally, the third category of materials is what we have called acquired materials. These are programs selected from the vast supply of film material already available in this country. By the nature of its operation, the Center does not intend to buy wholesale quantities of such materials, but rather plans to build its program patterns and acquire only those films which fit into its patterns.

I am certain I do not have to point out to any of you the almost unlimited possibilities in this field. In one category alone, the State Department has stored in New York City some forty million feet of film, part of which can perhaps be turned over to us. Just to find out what is in this material is a staggering job since the largest part of it is not catalogued or evaluated.

In addition, most other government agencies have shown a real interest in making their films available through the Center, thus reducing the number of contacts with which they might have to deal.

Apart from government film, we have a big job to do in screening other materials already produced. For example, we hope soon to have reliable data on somewhere between 1,000 and 1,500 titles which might be valuable for educational television purposes, a project which is being carried out for us by the Film Council of America. A similar project already has provided data on some 950 European educational films of possible interest and value to educational television.

Such will be the sources of supply which we hope to tap during the first year of operation. There will not be much variety in our program package the first year, but it is the best we can hope to do until production resources are built up around the country.

Naturally, this will not preclude the possibility of providing programs over and above those furnished in the package. For example, we are also exploring the possibility of providing some type of regular newsreel service, not in the usual sense, but in the way of a "news in depth" type of presentation. I must say that the possibilities of such a service do not look good to us at the present time--partly because of clearances, etc.--but at least we are carefully looking into the situation.

Even more important, we're also hoping to do a few distinguished things of a prestige nature. We realize there is some controversy on this point and we recognize the possibility, in the pressure of the moment, that such activity may be overlooked because it is expensive. But we certainly intend not to neglect this area and we hope to put on some things which are really outstanding--a program or series which will stand as a beacon light for anybody to look at and say, "This is what can be done--the goal to which we can all aspire in educational television."

Thus, I have tried to present rather briefly some of the background thinking as well as some of the problems of the Educational Television and Radio Center. Let me say again that we are pleased to be associated in this important educational enterprise with an organization such as you represent.

Questions and Answers

Question: I'd like to ask, speaking for those of us who are looking toward budgets and planning, and in line with the idea that you might some day be self-supporting, what sort of financing should we figure in our planning?

Newburn: I cannot answer that question in any detail at the moment because our Board has made no final decision. We are basing our plans, however, on two fundamental assumptions. These are (1) that the stations in the long run should pay for the program materials received from us, and (2) that in the initial years of operation with very restricted budgets this payment shouldn't be much more than a token one. Naturally, because the stations themselves will supply part of our material, we expect the long run charges to be less than the equivalent service might cost from other sources.

I also should add that we think there are other sources of income in addition to charges for program services. We feel there are national organizations, for example, which may be interested in granting money to an organization such as ours for the production of materials in broad areas of interest, without demanding specific advertising tags on the end product. At any rate, the problem of charges for service is one which we intend to talk over carefully with your advisory committee before we reach any final conclusions.

Question--Graydon Ausmus: My comment is upon a statement which you made which disturbs me a little, Dr. Newburn. You say you are not going to produce. Yet, I think there is a possibility, eventually, that someone is going to have to establish a production center for educational television. Perhaps this is not so much a question as a statement because I hope that is one aspect of the Center's operation which may be kept open.

Newburn: Our By-laws now would prevent us from producing and the Board is unanimous in the feeling that we ought not ourselves to engage in actual production. Having said that, however, I should add that you can always change By-laws.

Ausmus: I merely say this to get it on the record because I think there is a possibility that eventually we will have to have a central production agency for educational television programs.

Question--Allen Miller: I inferred correctly, though, from what you said that there is nothing to prevent you from seeing to it that there is production done by other organizations. In other words, you can determine what production is needed and can see to it that contracts are issued so that the end result is accomplished?

Newburn: That's right. If there is a vacuum in an area, we can move right in and see that something is produced, and we would have no hesitation in doing so. It's simply a matter of where the actual production is done and

we would prefer to have it handled by contract rather than developing our own staff to do the job.

Question--Pat Green: Will there be any distribution to commercial stations of anything which the Center handles?

Newburn: That is a basic policy question which has not yet been settled by our Board. Our present thinking, which I am glad to check with you, is that there should be no distribution to commercial outlets until the materials have been shown in that area on the educational stations. After they have been shown on educational stations, and if we have the necessary rights, the materials might be made available, some of them, to commercial stations.

Green: If there is no educational station in that area, however, and there may not be one for some time, will such a program be available for use in that area until there is an educational station?

Newburn: Generally no, if there is any reason to think there will be an educational station in that area. On the other hand, where there clearly will be no station for some time to come, we might make materials available to an educational institution for use on time donated by a commercial station. At least, we are considering that possibility.

Barrett: I wanted to ask about the potential acceptance of your editorial policies--that is your selection policies--by colleges, universities, state organizations, public school districts, and so forth. Do you expect any problems in this respect?

Newburn: Our evidence at the moment would indicate that stations which are going to be on the air in the next few months are so eager for help that such issues will not come to the front immediately as much as they might later. We do think this is a problem--and your question is a good one--but we intend to do everything we can to solve it before it arises. I already have indicated our plans to draw in large numbers of educational consultants, from all fields, to consult often and carefully with station managers on major items of program policy and through research to establish the areas of greatest need in the minds of educational leaders throughout the country.

There is still another way to offset any tendency for program control from a central source. That is to make programs adaptable to the local situation. Thus, for example, by supplying twenty minutes of film material for a thirty-minute program, we permit the local station to build its own local discussion for the remaining portion of the time. I believe this method has real possibilities and we are seriously considering it.

Ausmus: Many of us who have been the most active in educational television are concerned that in its first year of operation educational television may not put its best foot forward. In other words, the real potential of the

medium may not be demonstrated to the public at large. Can you give us a word of cheer and encouragement on this point?

Newburn: I think this is a very real concern that all of us should take to heart. From the standpoint of the stations, as well as the Center, it is highly important that what is done this first year be educationally significant and worthwhile and that we seek, even at the expense of quantity, to turn out a quality product. I am like the rest of you, having accepted this position because of the tremendous challenge which educational television offers. To live up to the potential, however, will be a difficult task which, if it can be done, will be a highly significant achievement in American education.

Ausmus: I think we can rise to the occasion.

ACADEMIC BROADCASTING

Dr. Alburey Castell
Chairman, Department of Philosophy, University of Oregon

*Delivered at the Region VI Meeting, Eugene, Oregon, October 17, 1953

I am to speak to you on Academic Broadcasting. I use that phrase to cover broadcasting by members of college and university faculties. I have no idea how much academic broadcasting there is in this country; but I have the strong conviction, that if it is well done, the more there is of it the better.

Before turning your attention to details, I wish to take this chance to express my lively appreciation for NAEB. Its efforts to put academic broadcasters in touch with listeners all over the nation are all to the good. For over ten years now I have been having an affair with the academic microphone; but no matter how sedulously I paid court to the lady, we never got beyond the range of the university station. And then along came NAEB, and before I knew it I was talking to listeners in states all over the union. Write-in mail began turning up from "far-away places with strange-sounding names". If you have mike-fever, there is a thrill in this. So I wish NAEB good luck, green lights, straight-aways, bon voyage, happy landing, and anything else it needs to keep it plugging away at its job.

I shall divide what I have to say into two parts. The first part is addressed to college and university administrators and station directors; persons whose business it is to use men, money and materials to a certain end. It is important that such persons have ideas about academic broadcasting, and that these ideas be out of the right drawer. My point is not that they should have these ideas in order that they may themselves do effective academic broadcasting. In many cases, the further they stay away from the mike, the happier everyone is going to be. My point is that they alone can give academic broadcasting the conditions which make it worthwhile. In this respect they are comparable to producers and directors among movie people. To these indispensible "providers" I would say eight things. If these eight points strike you as trivial or obvious, then either you operate in an academic radio paradise, or you are insufficiently aware of the importance of what you consider trivial and obvious.

(1) My first point is this: after the student-body and the football team, a good academic radio program is a university's best single public-relations investment. I would place it in many ways above an extension service. It does more than any other one agency to give reality to the nation of a "state-wide campus." It is there many hours each day. It is there many months each year. It gets into lives and homes with an intimacy which even class-rooms do not always generate. I have been flabbergasted to discover, in remote towns and villages, in isolated farms and camps, how persistently and respectvully and gratefully people maintain contact with their university radio. They wouldn't want it all day long. They wouldn't want only academic broadcasting. But they can learn to trust it for quality, to bring their minds as well as their ears when they tune it in. It is reassuring to realize that there is one station which doesn't want your money, doesn't want to sell you something, doesn't want to make you laugh or put you in touch with the front page of your newspaper. It is

---

* A full report of the meeting, together with a copy of the speech by Dr. Harry Newburn, president of the Educational TV and Radio Center, will be distributed as soon as it is available.

simply good business, good public relations, for a university to stand in this sort of relation to the radio public.

(2) The rest of my points assume the general truth of what I have just said. They go on to note that there is a price-tag, indeed several price-tags, on a good academic broadcasting program, and to ask whether administrators and directors acknowledge these price-tags, and think about them as frequently and vividly as they can. For example, ten years of academic broadcasting has taught me one rule which it is mike-folly to ignore; namely, that after all preparatory reading and study is over, it takes one hour to produce an effective five-minute script. There will be exceptions to this, but they are exceedingly rare. When they come along, you are thankful for them, but you never count on them. An administrator or a director who doesn't know that that is what he is asking for, is ignorant of the basic human cost of his commodity. That ratio, one hour's work to produce an effective five-minute script, does not alter as the script lengthens. If you are going to hold the mike's attention for ten minutes, set aside two hours; if for fifteen minutes, set aside three hours; if for thirty minutes, set aside six hours. For one academic year I was assigned to fill thirty minutes three times a week. That cost me eighteen hours every week. It made no difference whether you wrote the script out and read it, or thought it out and practically memorized, or worked from a note outline. It was still an hour's work to produce five minutes effective talk. I would repeat that this hour comes <u>after</u> all your preliminary reading and study is over.

(3) I can come at my next point this way. Academic broadcasting, once you realize its possibilities and demands, is hard and exacting business. In the professorial life there are few things to compare it with. No class-room is as hard to catch and hold as a mike. No class-room uses up your material as fast and inevitably as a mike. There are ways of stalling for time in a class-room, most of them useless to try on a mike. The mike merely turns a cold metallic eye on your script and says: "You are ill-prepared"; or, "You haven't enough there to last out"; or, "You have too much there for the amount of time you've got." As I said, academic broadcasting, once you realize its possibilities and demands, is hard and exacting business. Why then do universities make no allowances on teaching loads for conscientious and effective academic broadcasting? I have never heard of this being done. Why not? In these matters as in others, the laborer is worthy of his hire. Why do universities persistently exploit the fact that a man who relishes academic broadcasting can be left to sweat his fool head off?

(4) Why are stations, or the universities in back of them, so stingy when it comes to mimeographing scripts? This is an old gripe of mine. If a script is worth the work it takes to produce it and broadcast it, why is it not worth the extra cost needed to mimeograph it for distribution? Not to see this is a rebuke to the vanity and self-esteem of the broadcaster; and, as a count against it, that's not hay. It is also a let-down to the write-in people who think enough of what the station is putting out, to ask personally for a copy. It is a missed opportunity on the part of the university to drive home the fact that <u>it</u> stands back of the show and is pleased that its customers want its wares. My files are stuffed with letters asking for a copy of the script. And, except in cases which do nothing to mitigate this near-sighted policy, the answers have always had to be "Sorry; no can do." I am not alone in this. This is a matter which, soon or late, comes up for beefing whenever academic broadcasters are talking things over.

(5) I have yet to hear of a university radio station, that maintains a "talent scout". Why not? On our campus the students' daily newspaper does not

leave its business to chance. It has "news scouts." They swarm over the place like flies. Every week they pay a routine call and pump you for what they call "items." If they hear you are up to something, they have you on the phone before you can turn around. Campus news is their business. Now, by analogy, lecture talent is a station's business. I often visit other men's classes. More than once I have stumbled onto a lecture which was a "natural" for an academic mike. With a new head and tail it could have been lifted right out of the course and stood on its own. Whose business is it to know about such things? You can't expect the lecturer to realize that he has come forth (perhaps by accident) with a talk suited to the needs of the station. Even less can you expect him to come around and ask to be "taped" while he still has it where he can handle it. More than once I have had a strong hunch that Professor So-and-so, regardless of the lecture he might be putting out, has potential mike-talent. Whose business is it to keep after these things? Why isn't a campus kept under constant sensitive surveillance? No football coach, no campus editor, is as happy-go-lucky as some station directors I have known. How many program directors go out and shunt for their talent? How many have student assistants out in the field "spotting" for them?

(6) For what it is worth, I would urge upon universities and their stations the great utility of tapes. This used to be a sore point with me. I was against tapes. I thought they resulted in "canned" goods. But I was wrong about this. With a little coaching a person can be trained to warm up even to a tape. They are flexible as to time and place. They are storable. They are revisable. They are like cameras--doing their take and salting it away. I see less and less need for "live" broadcasting in academic affairs.

(7)Having said this, I would add that one of the great values of a tape is that it lets a person listen to a play-back as soon as he is through. This is a point which cannot be over-emphasized. Always urge a man to sit through a play-back as soon as he has come away from the mike. Never make him feel that this is either a bother or a mere routine. If it is a "bother", you have a wrong perspective. If it is a"mere routine," he has a wrong perspective. There is nothing that will teach a man the things he needs to know as quickly and surely as a play-back. If he has done well, but thinks otherwise, it will help to restore his nerve. If he has done poorly, but thinks otherwise, it will confront him with the facts. If you know how to help him, the play-back provides you with documentary evidence for your points. A play-back, in the hands of a sympathetic and skillful program director has many of the virtues of a "confessional". Many a time I have come away from such ordeals with a heightened sense of sin but with a determination to do better next time.

(8) My last point to administrators and directors has to do with a matter upon which I have had little first-hand experience but upon which I have done thinking. I mean academic television. Right now I think this is an overrated potentiality. I am convinced that when a university adds a radio station it adds far more to its resources than it will when it adds television to its radio. A university without radio is drastically cut off. A university with radio but without television is not drastically cut off. A university can do a great deal for its customers, given broadcasting facilities. But the nature of its clientele and the nature of its materials are such that not as much proportionately is added when you pass from broadcasting to television. A university station lives by its appeal to the minds of its listeners. To do this at least one sense medium is essential. When you add a second sense (in this case vision) you encounter diminishing returns. When I learned what it cost one university to add television I could not help wondering whether the returns were worth the added investment; and I could not help thinking how some or all of that money

might have been spent to improve and extend the station's broadcasting resources.

II

I want now to shift from administrators and directors to faculty colleagues as academic broadcasters. If academic broadcasting is to be a reality, it will be because they make it so. Unless they have "the will to broadcast", their station will be little more than an administrative play-toy. When Professor Perry at Harvard wrote his autobiography he called it "And gladly teach." You can borrow that phrase. It must be, or become possible to say "and gladly broadcast." Without that, academic broadcasting will get no real status. I would have such persons think along two lines: as to choosing a subject; and as to handling it.

(1) As to a choice of subject, these five suggestions. (a) first, what I call the "magic platitude": choose something which you can make both interesting and valuable. Neither alone is enough. If you can't make the subject interesting, leave it alone. Avoid boring your listeners as you would avoid the plague. If they cannot say later "You know, I heard an interesting broadcast the other day," you have lost Round One. But you must aim at more than that. To make your subject interesting is necessary, but it is not sufficient. You must also make it valuable. This distinction is quite real. It is one thing to say "I heard an interesting broadcast"; it is another thing to say "I heard a valuable broadcast." Over the years academic broadcasting must include the second in its aim. The people who listen to academic broadcasting are people who are capable of value-judgments. Never forget that fact about them. If you do, they will forget about you. I have referred to this mandatory combination ("interesting and valuable") as "the magic platitude." It is just that. It is a platitude. What could be more of a platitude? But it is magic, also. I say that because its results are nothing short of magic; also because I know of no scientific rules for stating it. To say "Be interesting and valuable or be off" is good advice. To say "This is how to make your stuff interesting and valuable" is to invoke something of an art, something that throws you back upon intuitions, something that goes into the making of poems and the painting of pictures and the telling of stories. These considerations however do not disqualify the ideal. The persisting ideal here is qualitative. It defines for you the character of your excellence.

(b) you can do more with the magic platitude than merely state it. You can say, for example, "choose a topic upon which feeling is strong but about which reflection is not usual though it is profitable." That statement goes a long way to defining a good topic for academic broadcasting. There must be something about your topic which taps the feeling, the concern, of your listeners. You get nowhere by plugging in on indifference. When I say "feeling" I do not mean "emotion." I do not mean that academic broadcasting to be interesting and valuable must play on the emotions of its listeners. It must tap matters upon which they feel strongly in the sense of having strong convictions. But that was not all. "Upon which feeling is strong but about which reflection is not usual," or has not carried them far. This gives your power of reflection an area in which to spark, an area of dry timber which has not been burned over. Under those circumstances you can start a fire in their minds. That was still not all. "Upon which feeling is strong but about which reflection is not usual though it is profitable." That last clause is important too. There is no point to blazing a trail which leads nowhere. Your powers of reflection must open up things which your listener's mind would have gotten around to had he brought his powers of thinking to bear upon it. Your topic matters to him, but he has not thought too much about it. You get him to think about it along lines

which he would have moved had he put his mind to it. If you can do that, he will find you both interesting and valuable. And he will be waiting for you any time his leisure permits.

(c) What I have just said suggests another approach to the "magic platitude." Choose a matter upon which you have genuine feelings; and about which you know more and have thought harder than your listener. This does not mean "talk down" to him. Few things are worse than that. But he must feel that you are worth listening to. He must feel that you have something which he hasn't. Otherwise your ideas are, as the French say, "deja vues", old hat. In a perfectly unobjectionable sense of the words, he must feel that you are superior to him in respect to your topic. It is fatal to be so "folksy" that a listener who lets you into his mind for half an hour feels no pressures while you are there, feels in nowise "stretched" after you are gone. That would not be academic broadcasting as I understand the term. There is no place here for Jack Benny or Arthur Godfrey. You have a part to play and your best chance of playing it well is to have a subject which has laid hold on your own mind, about which you know more and have thought harder than your listener.

(2) My first piece of advice was: Pick a topic which you can make both interesting and valuable. (a) My second is this: Learn to read from a script as though you were talking; and learn to write such scripts. I have strong convictions on this. There are in academic broadcasting two things which are an abomination. One is the man who is trying to ad lib his stuff. The other is the man who is reading his script and sound like it. I don't know which is worse. Several perils attend the first man. He may wander around. He may become repetitious. He may fall into seconds of silence or uh-ing and ah-ing. He may talk himself out before his time is up and start padding. He may be only part way through when his time is up and start cutting corners. He may be unnerved by the impersonality of the mike and become stilted and strained; or try to offset this by getting "folksy" and "anecdotal." He may start listening to the sound of his own voice. These are all bad. They have all happened to me, and the memory of them brings out a cold sweat. And the point is, they are all unnecessary. A properly concocted script, worked at until you can read it as though you were talking it, is all that is needed. There are two matters here. It must be properly concocted. It must be written as you would talk when you are doing normal straightforward academic talking. This does not mean "written as you would write an article." A radio script is not at all the same as a manuscript. It must fit your personality more closely. It must be less packed and more expressive. It has a place for short sentences; for rhetorical questions; for homely idiom; for racy metaphor; for the first person singular; for passages you would normally say with a smile or a frown or a look of puzzlement. The point is, a script must be written to be talked. When read aloud it must not sound as though it were written to be read. This is a knack. Any self-respecting academic who wants to broadcast can learn to do it. There are two steps. One, you learn to write as you would normally talk; two, you learn to read what you have thus written as though you were talking and not reading. This takes a little self-knowledge, a little rewriting, and rather more than a little practice at making your tongue say what your eye sees, in the manner that you speak when you talk.

(b) Anything else I can say is secondary to that. But for what they are worth, I shall close with a few miscellaneous do's and don'ts. (1) Never undertake less that fifteen minutes or more than thirty minues. There is a certain solidity to the subject-matter of academic broadcasting. It is not news or anecdotes or jokes. It doesn't come in less than fifteen minute packages. It normally contains exposition, description, narration, argument, criticism; and these take time. It is addressed to the mind, and it takes time to involve a listener's mind

in what you want to say. These very things which make less than fifteen minutes too little, make more than thirty minutes too much. If you are working your listener as hard as he has a right to expect, don't ask him to stay with you beyond thirty minutes. Demand close listening; but don't demand it for more than thirty minutes, because you won't get it. (2) Presuppose as close to nothing as you can. Supply what your listener has to have to follow you. This may cramp your style; but put up with the cramps, if you want listeners. This is not to say that your listeners are ignorant. They aren't; but they don't have your specialized knowledge and they haven't given as much thought to your topic as you have. Your language is esoteric. Your information is esoteric. Your pattern of thought is esoteric. These are obstacles to be overcome. (3) Don't attempt "academic serials." Assume that you are playing a one-night stand, even if you aren't. A studio is not a class room. When you dismiss a class on Monday there is a reasonable presumption that it will return for more on Wednesday and Friday. You cannot assume that about a radio audience. Whatever your point is, you must get it across here and now. You cannot say "This will become clearer as we proceed", or "your outside reading will development my point for you." (3) Do not seek to edify or exhort. There is nothing wrong with edification or exhortion; but they are not your assignement. Your business is to interest, to inform, to clarify, to challenge, to criticize, to invite minds to range wider and deeper, to raise questions of principle, to point out presuppositions. These are the stock-in-trade of academic broadcasting. They are worth going after for their own sakes. You are an academic, not an ecclesiastic or a politician. This does not mean "be cynical", or "be neutral on everything", or "be coldly impersonal." It means consider your listeners as minds or intellects to be informed, not as wills to be shaped or souls to be saved. (4) Remember always that you are not addressing a captive audience. This is one of the small number of ways in which the studio differs crucially from the class-room. You may lose touch with your students but normally they continue to sit there. They can't tune you out. Until the bell rings there is little they can do about you. But you don't have that kind of hold one your radio audience. They don't have to stay with you; and, what is more, they don't have to pass your tests. With them you are up against free men. You must keep it coming and keep it good. (5) Remember also, that between your mind and the minds you are addressing there is only your voice and their ears. This is another crucial difference between studio and class-room. In a manner of speaking, your listeners are stone blind. What difference would it make to you in class if your students were all blind? The force of this analogy was brought home to me once when I had a blind boy in class. I accosted him one day in the corridor and asked "How are things coming on? Everything alright?" He said "As well as can be expected." The tone of his voice led me to say, "What do you mean, 'As well as can be expected'?" "Well,"he said, "all I can do is hear your voice. I can't see your face. I can't see what you put on the board. When you draw diagrams or jot down phrases--and you do a lot of that--I lose touch. In fact, being in class is something like listening to the radio." He made my point in that last remark.

PROGRAM
NAEB Region VI Meeting
October 16-17, 1953

FRIDAY, October 16

8:30 - 9:00 Registration, Second Floor Lobby, Erb Memorial Student Union

MORNING SESSION

Allen Miller, Chairman
Director, Region VI, NAEB
Manager, Station KWSC
Pullman, Washington

9:00 - 9:50 Introductions and reports--Room 315, Erb Memorial Union

9:50 - 10:00 Greeting -- Dr. Victor Morris
Acting President, University of Oregon

10:00 - 11:00 The National View -- Educational Radio and Television
Graydon Ausmus
President NAEB
Director of Radio & TV
University of Alabama (WUOA)

Resource Panel:
Frank Schooley
Treasurer NAEB
Manager WILL
University of Illinois

Dr. Harry J. Skornia
Executive Director, NAEB

11:00 - 12:00 Promoting Educational Broadcasting
"Mobilizing the Community for Educational Television"
Dr. John R. Richards
Vice-Chancellor,
Oregon State System of Higher Education

Resource Panel:
Travis Cross
Director, Division of Information
Oregon State System of Higher Education

Dr. Miner T. Patton
Secretary, Community Television
Incorporated, Portland, Oregon
Principal, Duniway School, Portland

12:15 - 1:30 Luncheon Meeting--Room 110, Erb Memorial Union

AFTERNOON SESSION

James M. Morris, Chairman
Program Manager, KOAC
Corvallis, Oregon

1:30 - 5:00 Panel Discussion: Your NAEB, Its Services and Aims

Panel: Graydon Ausmus
Frank Schooley
Harry Skornia

(After brief presentation by each of the panel, questions and discussions from the floor will be in order.)

6:30 Banquet Meeting--Room 110, Erb Memorial Union
Glenn Starlin, Chairman
Director of Radio
University of Oregon (KWAX)

Address -- "The Educational Television and Radio Center"
Dr. Harry K. Newburn, President
Ann Arbor, Michigan

8:30 Open House--Dad's Room, Erb Memorial Union

- - - - -

SATURDAY, October 17 Room 315, Erb Memorial Union

MORNING SESSION

Edwin H. Adams, Chairman
Head, Division of Radio and Television
School of Communications
University of Washington (KUOW)

9:00 - 10:00 Observations on Mass Media
"Academic Broadcasting"
Dr. Alburey Castell
Chairman, Department of Philosophy
University of Oregon

10:00 - 12:00 Information Please - Membership Reports, Discussions, Sharing of Problems

12:15 - 1:30 Luncheon Meeting - Sweden House Smorgasbord, 1258 Kincaid

AFTERNOON SESSION

Miss Patricia L. Green, Chairman
Manager Radio Station KBPS
Portland Public Schools

1:30 - 5:00 Television Workshop
William C. Dempsey
Educational Director
Television Station KPIX
San Francisco, California

Roster of Participants in NAEB Region VI Meeting

Eugene, Oregon, October 16-17, 1953

KOAC
James Morris
Fred Gleeson
Robert Hinz
Mrs. Gladys Chambers
Lester Mock
Robert M. Roberts
Phil Kalar
Arnold Ebert
Fred Brewer
Duane Tucker

KWSC
Allen Miller
R. C. Norris
Cal Watson
Robert Baird
Glenn Southworth

KBPS
Patricia Green
Marilyn Livingston

KWAX and
The University of Oregon
D. Glenn Starlin
Travis Cross
Alburey Castell
Victor P. Morris

KUOW
Edwin H. Adams

KSDS
Edwin G. Barrett

KCVN
John Crabbe

KPIX
William C. Dempsey

KPFA
Wallace Hamilton

KCSM
Richard P. Marsh

NAEB Officers
Graydon Ausmus
Frank Schooley
Harry Skornia

DuMont
Bob Myers

ETRC
Harry K. Newburn

Scanned from the National Association of Educational Broadcasters Records
at the Wisconsin Historical Society as part of
"Unlocking the Airwaves: Revitalizing an Early Public and Educational Radio Collection."

A collaboration among the Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities,
University of Wisconsin-Madison Department of Communication Arts,
and Wisconsin Historical Society.

Supported by a Humanities Collections and Reference Resources grant from
the National Endowment for the Humanities

MITH MARYLAND INSTITUTE FOR TECHNOLOGY IN THE HUMANITIES

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

WISCONSIN HISTORICAL SOCIETY

WISCONSIN UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE Humanities

Any views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication/collection do not necessarily reflect those of the National Endowment for the Humanities.